Docket No.: CISCO-3701

REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 2-5 are cancelled. Claim 8 is cancelled. Claim 9 is

amended. Claims 12-17 are amended. Claim 18 is cancelled. Claims 19 and 20 are

amended. Claim 23 is amended. Claims 24-27 are cancelled. Claim 28 is amended.

Claim 30 is cancelled. Claims 31 and 32 are amended. Claims 34-39 are amended.

Claim 40 is cancelled. Claims 41 and 42 are amended. Claim 45 is amended. Claims

46-49 are cancelled. Claim 50 is amended. Claim 52 is cancelled. Claim 53 is currently

amended. Claims 56-62 are amended. Claim 64 is amended. Claims 67-87 are cancelled

Claims 1-87 remain rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Lund

(US Patent 6,658,100) in view of Morton (U.S. Patent 6,480,484). Applicant respectfully

traverses this rejection, and asserts that Lund and Morton do not disclose all of the

limitations of independent claims 1, 23, 45, 67, and 77. Specifically, Lund and Morton

fail to disclose a protocol server, which is integral to the present invention. Claim 1 of

the present application has been amended and now reads:

1.   A method for providing an improved interface to a caller during the initiation of a
VoIP call comprising: placing, by the caller, a request for information regarding a party
to be called; returning a URL responsive to said request; displaying to said caller one or
more connection options corresponding to said URL; selecting at least one of said one or
more connection options; providing said URL to a protocol server; placing a call
responsive to said at least one selected connection options by entering a phone number;
routing the entered phone number to the protocol server; and routing a session request
corresponding to said one or more connection options to the protocol server.

16

For purposes of discussion, since the limitations of claim 1 are recited in the remaining independent claims 23 and 45, the following analysis is extended to arguments for those claims with respect to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of those claims.

For the claimed limitation of routing an entered phone number to a protocol server, Examiner has cited Lund at col. 2, lines 20-22 and line 25; also FIG. 2 (SSPs 22,24,26,28). However, Lund at col. 2, lines 20-22 only states "...*an Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) SSP is a central office equipped with AIN software. AIN software can enable an (service switching point) SSP to suspend call processing and launch a query to a service control point (SCP),*" which is not the same as a protocol server. As described in the present application at page 8, line 15, the protocol server provides a number mapping service which translates a phone number to an (IP address:Protocol) pair.

With respect to Examiner's assertion that claim 1's limitation of providing a URL to the protocol server is disclosed by Lund at col. 3, lines 23-24, Applicant also traverses this characterization of Lund. Lund, at col. 3, lines 23-24 reads: *querying a database to retrieve the calling party's URL based on the number dialed.* However, this is not the same as function of the protocol server of the present invention, which retrieves a (IP address:Protocol pair). Simply retrieving a URL does not provide any protocol information, which is integral to a protocol server's function.

Applicant was only able to find reference to the word "protocol" in Lund in col. 2. At lines 28-30, Lund reads: *The elements of the network 20 communicate over links 46 using network signaling protocols and over links 48 carrying voice and data traffic.* At

line 48, Lund reads: *Both the tandem switches 30 and 32, and the SSPs 22-28, transfer network signaling protocols over links 46 to the STPs 34 and 36. The network signaling protocols, such as those defined by the well known Signaling System 7, control the network switching of voice and data traffic. STPs 34 and 36 transfer network signaling protocols over links 46 within or between regions and to SCPs 38 and 40.*

Applicant does not dispute that network signaling protocol is not used in Lund, but rather that Lund fails to describe the protocol *server* of the present invention. Without further description of a protocol server, Applicant respectfully submits that Lund fails to disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the presence or utilization of a protocol *server* as described and claimed in the present invention.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has addressed all grounds for rejection and objection as stated in the Office action mailed 5/08/06, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and place this application in condition for allowance.

INVITATION TO TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

If any remaining issues exist, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

18

Docket No.: CISCO-3701

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP,
LTD.

Date: December 12, 2006

[signature: John Crosby]

John W. Crosby
Reg. No. 49,058

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, Nevada 89449
Telephone: (775) 586-9500

19